DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 887 HE 034 708

AUTHOR	MacFarland, Thomas W.
TITLE	Students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students.
INSTITUTION	Nova Southeastern Univ., Ft. Lauderdale, FL. Research and Planning.
REPORT NO	NSU-R-96-13
PUB DATE	1996-08-00
NOTE	30p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Business Education; *College Students; Distance Education; Entrepreneurship; Higher Education; Off Campus Facilities; *On Campus Students; Program Effectiveness; *Satisfaction; Services; *Student Attitudes; Student Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Nova Southeastern University FL

ABSTRACT

Levels of satisfaction with program and services were assessed for students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship at Nova Southeastern University, Florida. Usable responses were received from 391 students (193 on-campus, 195 off-campus, and 3 others) from the population of 2,184 students. Survey statements were worded using language from the criteria for accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. More than 92% of all statements received a mean rating of 3.0 or better on a 5-point scale, indicating positive satisfaction with academic program and student services. Overall ratings between on-campus and off-campus students were nearly equal, although for approximately 45% of all survey statements, off-campus students provided higher mean ratings than on-campus students. For approximately 55% of all statements, on-campus students provided higher mean ratings. Results support the assumption that the university needed to initiate activities to increase access to the university's technology-based information resource infrastructure for off-campus students. (Contains 8 tables and 15 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 887

STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESPOND TO A SATISFACTION SURVEY: A COMPARISON BETWEEN ON-CAMPUS STUDENTS AND OFF-CAMPUS STUDENTS

Thomas W. MacFarland

Senior Research Associate

T. MacFarland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Nova Southeastern University
Research and Planning

August 1996

HE 034 708

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was prepared to assess levels of satisfaction with program and services for students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship who were enrolled during Winter Term 1996. Previous activities had focused on a broad assessment of students from all five academic centers with off-campus offerings (N = 12,499). Site personnel returned 391 useable surveys to Research and Planning (On-campus N = 193, Off-campus N = 195, and Unidentified Place of Attendance N = 3) from the population of 2,184 School of Business and Entrepreneurship students.

Attention was directed to differences between levels of satisfaction from students who attended the majority of their classes on the University's Davie Campus and the immediate Broward County area (on-campus students) and their counterparts who attended the majority of their classes at other locations (off-campus students). Although these comparisons serve as a useful differentiation between on-campus students and off-campus students, it should be recalled that there are multiple sources of data in the University's *Master Plan* (1995) and *Institutional Self-Study Report* (1996) that provide additional information on the practice and efficacy of distance education at the University.

Survey statements were worded using language directly from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996). Over 92 percent of all statements received a mean rating of 3.0 or greater (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), indicating positive satisfaction with academic program and student services. Overall ratings between on-campus students and off-campus students were nearly equal. For approximately 45 percent of all survey statements, off-campus students provided higher mean ratings than on-campus students, and for approximately 55 percent of all survey statements, on-campus students provided higher mean ratings than off-campus students.

Comparison of results between on-campus students and off-campus students confirmed the assumption that the University needed to initiate a series of activities to increase access to the University's technology-based information resource infrastructure for off-campus students. Along with the planned University-wide expenditure of over $3.6 million budgeted in Fiscal Year 1996 - 1997 for technology and related capital expenditures, a brief listing of proactive measures that are currently in use by the School of Business and Entrepreneurship to raise student satisfaction with the information infrastructure to even higher levels was identified.

HIGHLIGHTS

Identification of the Population

- This study represented a broad assessment of students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship.
- U.S.-based respondents were enrolled in programs offered in Alabama, Florida, Virginia, and Arizona.
- Respondents were also enrolled in programs offered at international locations, including clusters in the Bahamas, Canada, Germany, Jamaica, and Panama.

Purpose of This Report

- Along with a request for demographic and marketing information, respondents were also queried on their level of satisfaction with issues linked to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996).
- Over 92 percent of all statements received a mean rating of 3.0 or greater (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), indicating positive satisfaction with academic program and student services.
- The summative statement **Overall quality of this academic program** received a higher rating from off-campus respondents (Mean = 4.0) than their on-campus counterparts (Mean = 3.8).

Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media

Approximately 20 percent of all off-campus respondents and 10 percent of all on-campus respondents indicated experience with electronic mail as a technology-based instructional medium.

Reasons for Selecting the University

- For on-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
  - Convenience . . . . . 65.3 percent
  - Location . . . . . 54.4 percent
  - Type of Programs Available . . . . . 54.4 percent
- For off-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
  - Convenience . . . . . 71.3 percent
  - Location . . . . . 60.0 percent
  - Type of Programs Available . . . . . 49.7 percent
- Nearly 25 percent of all on-campus respondents and 65 percent of all off-campus respondents did not select attendance at a college or university as an option had they not attended Nova Southeastern University.

Satisfaction with Program and Services

- Off-campus respondents provided higher mean ratings than their on-campus counterparts for approximately one-half of all survey statements, including statements related to: instructional methods, delivery system, competency of the faculty, quality of the learning environment, opportunity for intellectual growth, faculty and student interaction, exposure to research scholars, and opportunity for peer interaction.
- On-campus respondents indicated higher levels of satisfaction than off-campus respondents for statements related to the University's technology-based information resource infrastructure. Processes that are currently in place to increase off-campus access to this information infrastructure were identified.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
HIGHLIGHTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose of This Study	1
METHODOLOGY	2
Survey Development	2
Sampling	3
Population and Invited Sample	3
Responding Sample	4
RESULTS	5
Demographic Composition of the Responding Sample	5
Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media	5
Satisfaction With the University	5
Academic Programs and Student Services	6

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

DISCUSSION 15

SUMMARY 17

REFERENCES 18

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Degree Level	7
2	Gender	7
3	Ethnicity	8
4	Majority Place of Class Attendance	8
5	Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media	9
6	Frequency of Response to Reasons for Attending Nova Southeastern University	10
7	Frequency of Response to What Survey Respondents Would Have Done if They had not Attended Nova Southeastern University	11
8	Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs And Student Services	12

INTRODUCTION

Background

The University first offered graduate instruction in Business Administration in 1972, at the same time when the off-campus Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership and the Ed.D. Program for Community College Faculty and Administrators were first implemented. In 1973 the master's degree program in Business Administration was consolidated into the Graduate Management Program, and in 1978 doctoral programs began within the Graduate Management Program (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book;* 1996, p. 9-11).

The Graduate Management Program was reorganized in 1980 into the Center for the Study of Administration, which served as the precursor to the University's current School of Business and Entrepreneurship. The programs in this School, which included off-campus offerings, were fully integrated into *Self-Study* reports when the University received reaffirmation of accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1975 and 1985 (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book;* 1996, p. 9-11). The School of Business and Entrepreneurship presently offers master's and doctoral programs throughout Florida and at cluster locations in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and international clusters in the Bahamas, Canada, Germany, Jamaica, and Panama (*Off-Campus Program Directory*, 1996).

As part of the current process for reaffirmation of accreditation, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools assembled a Visiting Team at the University in February 1996. This Visiting Team received orientation from University administrators on a variety of issues, including orientation on current distance education activities at the University. Members of this Visiting Team met with students, faculty, and staff at selected off-campus sites throughout Winter Term 1996. These visits were planned to provide an advance framework for the full Visiting Team's presence at the University in October 1996.

Purpose of This Study

Extending the evaluations contained in annual reports, such as *Quality Improvement Plans, Administrative and Educational Support Services: 1994-95* (1995) and *Status Report on Institutional Effectiveness: 1994 - 1995* (1995), Research and Planning in cooperation with those centers most involved with distance education prepared a plan (Memorandum from

Tom MacFarland to John Losak; September 22, 1995) to survey both students and graduates as reflected in the following reports:

- Research and Planning Report 96-02; *Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us What They Think About Their Undergraduate Experience.*

- Research and Planning Report 96-03; *Place of Class Attendance at Nova Southeastern University: Calendar Years 1990 to 1994.*

- Research and Planning Report 96-05; *Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*

- Research and Planning Report 96-06; *Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experiences.*

- Research and Planning Report 96-07; *Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*

- Research and Planning Report 96-08; *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey.*

Although this report provides another perspective to these analyses, it should be recalled that there are multiple sources of data in the University's *Master Plan* (1995) and *Institutional Self-Study Report* (1996) that provide additional information on the practice and efficacy of distance education at the University.

METHODOLOGY

Survey Development

Survey development was described in full detail in *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey* (1996). Most demographic selections and marketing-type statements in the survey (Appendix) were specific to the University, and these selections were tested in prior survey activities initiated by Research and Planning. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996) and *Guidelines for Planning Distance Learning Activities* (1992) served as major references for the development of most Likert-type survey statements.

Sampling

Population and Invited Sample

The population for the entire survey process consisted of all Winter Term 1996 students enrolled in the five academic centers with distance education programs (N = 12,499; *Research and Planning Weekly Enrollment Report*, April 29, 1996). With specific reference to students represented by programs offered by the School of Business and Entrepreneurship (N = 2,184; *Research and Planning Weekly Enrollment Report*, April 29, 1996), site administrators at the following locations were instructed to distribute the survey instrument to students sometime between March 25 to April 25, 1996, depending on local cluster meeting dates:

- Florida
  - Orlando

    Master of Business Administration (MBA) . . . . . N = 33
  - Tampa

    Master of Business Administration (MBA) . . . . . N = 40
- Other States
  - Alabama

    Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) . . . . . N = 4
  - Arizona

    Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) . . . . . N = 21
  - Virginia

    Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) . . . . . N = 25
    Doctor of Public Administration (DPA) . . . . . N = 9
- International
  - Bahamas

    Master of Business Administration (MBA) . . . . . N = 50

- Canada

  Master of Business Administration (MBA) . . . . . N = 25
  Master of Human Resource Management (MS-HRM) . . . . . N = 12

- Germany

  Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) . . . . . N = 8

- Jamaica

  Master of Business Administration (MBA) . . . . . N = 177

- Panama

  Master of Business Administration (MBA) . . . . . N = 115

TOTAL . . . . . N = 459

The invited sample also included a sample of students attending class on campus, with this sample approximating the total number of field-based students completing the survey. Program staff were asked to distribute the survey to campus-based students who were similar to their field-based counterparts in terms of age and other demographic characteristics, if at all possible.

Responding Sample

Site personnel in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship returned 391 useable surveys to Research and Planning, for a return rate of approximately 45 percent:

- On-campus . . . . . N = 193
- Off-campus . . . . . N = 195
- Unidentified . . . . . N = 3

A limitation to this study was that it is not possible to accurately determine the percentage of survey return. During survey distribution and return, there were cases where the total number of surveys distributed to students and the completed number of surveys in each packet were not accurately recorded. Although it is not possible to offer a calculation of return percentage, it is reasonable to think that the return percentage is high, since survey completion was an in-class activity, administered by instructors and site personnel.

RESULTS

Demographic Composition of the Responding Sample

Tables 1 to 4 provide demographic information about the responding sample. In regard to contrasts between on-campus students and off-campus students, key findings include the following observations:

- Approximately 90 percent of all respondents were enrolled in a master's program.
- Approximately 50 percent of all on-campus and off-campus respondents were female, and 50 percent were male.
- Slightly more than 60 percent of all on-campus respondents indicated ethnicity or race as White. In contrast, less than 25 percent of all off-campus respondents indicated ethnicity or race as White.
- The responding sample consisted of nearly 50 percent on-campus students and 50 percent off-campus students. Over one-third of all respondents attended a cluster location in another country.

Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media

The experience of survey respondents with technology-based instructional media is presented in Table 5. The use of electronic mail as an instructional medium was identified by approximately 20 percent of all off-campus respondents. In contrast, less than 10 percent of all on-campus respondents indicated experience with electronic mail.

Satisfaction With the University

Survey respondents were also presented with statements that focused on satisfaction with the University. Table 6 summarizes responses to the statement **Why did you decide to attend NSU?** There were no differences in rank order of response between on-campus respondents and off-campus respondents for the three leading responses:

- For on-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
  - Convenience . . . . . 65.3 percent
  - Location . . . . . 54.4 percent
  - Type of Programs Available . . . . . 54.4 percent
- For off-campus respondents, the three leading selections were:
  - Convenience . . . . . 71.3 percent
  - Location . . . . . 60.0 percent
  - Type of Programs Available . . . . . 49.7 percent

Survey respondents were also asked to identify alternates if they had not attended the University. Table 7 compares selections by on-campus respondents to off-campus respondents. Nearly 25 percent of all on-campus respondents and 65 percent of all off-campus respondents did not select attendance at a college or university as an option had they not attended Nova Southeastern University.

Academic Programs and Student Services

The survey included statements that were directly based on accreditation criteria found in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' *Criteria for Accreditation* (1996). Descriptive statistics for these statements are presented in Table 8, comparing on-campus respondents to their off-campus counterparts. Over 92 percent of all statements received a mean rating of 3.0 or greater (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), indicating positive satisfaction with academic program and student services.

Overall ratings between on-campus students and off-campus students were nearly equal. For approximately 45 percent of all survey statements, off-campus students provided higher mean ratings than on-campus students, and for approximately 55 percent of all survey statements, on-campus students provided higher mean ratings than off-campus students. The highest rating (Mean = 4.3) was offered by off-campus respondents for **Length of the academic program** and **Opportunity for peer interaction**.

Table 1

Degree Level

	On-Campus		Off-Campus	
Degree Level	N	%	N	%
Master's	173	89.6	167	85.6
Doctoral	--	---	13	6.7
Unidentified	20	10.4	15	7.7
Total	193		195	

Table 2

Gender

	On-Campus		Off-Campus	
Gender	N	%	N	%
Female	94	48.7	100	51.3
Male	98	50.8	93	47.7
Unidentified	1	0.5	2	1.0
Total	193		195	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Ethnicity or Race

	On-Campus		Off-Campus	
Ethnicity or Race	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
African-American	22	11.4	9	4.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	---	---	---	---
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	2.6	11	5.6
Hispanic	35	18.1	33	16.9
White	116	60.1	46	23.6
Other	13	6.7	87	44.6
Unidentified	2	1.0	9	4.6
Total	193		195	

Table 4

Majority Place of Class Attendance

	N	%
Davie Campus or East Campus	165	42.2
Cluster Location in Broward, Dade, Monroe, or Palm Beach County	28	7.2
Cluster Location in Another Florida County	7	1.8
Cluster Location in Another State	7	1.8
Cluster Location in Another Country	140	35.8
Other	41	10.5
Missing	3	0.8
Total	391	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Experience with Technology-Based Instructional Media

	On-Campus		Off-Campus	
Response	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Audiobridge	1	0.5	4	2.1
Compressed Video	8	4.1	34	17.4
Electronic Mail	19	9.8	40	20.5
Electronic Classroom	2	1.0	5	2.6
Other	6	3.1	16	8.2

Table 6

Frequency of Response to Reasons for Attending Nova Southeastern University

	On-Campus		Off-Campus	
Reasons for attending NSU	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Academic Reputation	49	25.4	60	30.8
Admissions Standards	33	17.1	22	11.3
Advice of Counselors and Teachers	9	4.7	8	4.1
Availability of Scholarships or Financial Aid	9	4.7	6	3.1
Convenience	126	65.3	139	71.3
Cost	14	7.3	57	29.2
Location	105	54.4	117	60.0
Small Class Size	48	24.9	39	20.0
Social Atmosphere	11	5.7	25	12.8
Type of Programs Available	105	54.4	97	49.7
Other	26	13.5	16	8.2

Table 7

Frequency of Response to What Survey Respondents Would Have Done if They had not Attended Nova Southeastern University

	On-Campus		Off-Campus	
Response	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Attended another private college or university in South Florida	59	30.6	16	8.2
Attended another private college or university in Florida but not in South Florida	3	1.6	4	2.1
Attended a private college or university in another state	5	2.6	17	8.7
Attended a state college or university in South Florida	66	34.2	4	2.1
Attended a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	8	4.1	7	3.6
Attended a state college or university in another state	5	2.6	21	10.8
Not attended a college or university	7	3.6	16	8.2
Other	3	1.6	89	45.6
Unidentified	37	19.2	21	10.8
Total	193		195	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8

Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs and Student Services:

	On-Campus			Off-Campus		
Statement	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies . . .	187	4.0	0.8	185	4.0	0.8
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	151	3.8	1.0	158	3.6	1.0
Clarity of written completion requirements	186	3.9	0.8	180	4.1	0.8
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	184	4.0	0.8	177	3.9	0.8
Program orientation	165	3.5	1.0	179	3.9	0.9
Length of the academic program	189	4.2	0.9	189	4.3	0.8
Length of the individual courses	187	4.1	0.9	187	4.1	0.8
Instructional methods	175	3.8	0.9	185	4.0	0.8
Delivery system	167	3.8	0.8	180	4.0	0.8
Course registration activities	186	3.9	1.0	188	3.9	0.9
Published grading policy	171	3.9	0.9	170	3.8	0.9
Interaction with administrative personnel	175	3.7	1.1	186	3.8	1.0
Competency of the faculty	176	3.9	0.9	180	4.1	0.8
Quality of the learning environment . . .	178	3.9	0.8	189	4.0	0.8
Process for assigning students to advisors	119	3.1	1.2	109	3.3	1.0
Quality of advising	125	3.2	1.2	124	3.5	1.0
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	63	3.5	0.8	103	3.9	0.8
Opportunity for intellectual growth	177	4.0	0.8	185	4.1	0.9
Faculty and student interaction	168	3.9	0.8	176	4.1	0.8

Table 8 (Continued)

Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs and Student Services:

	On-Campus			Off-Campus		
Statement	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**
Exposure to research scholars	105	3.2	1.0	133	3.3	1.0
Opportunity for peer interaction	168	4.0	0.8	184	4.3	0.8
Clarity of program catalog	175	3.9	0.8	171	3.9	0.8
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	153	3.8	1.1	163	3.8	1.0
Availability of library and learning resource materials	165	3.7	1.0	178	3.3	1.1
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	159	3.5	1.0	169	3.4	1.1
Orientation program relative to library services	193	3.0	1.1	154	3.3	1.0
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	127	2.9	1.2	143	3.0	1.0
Availability of computing resources	124	3.4	1.0	137	2.9	1.1
Adequacy of computing resources	120	3.5	1.0	121	3.0	1.0
Access to information through technology	130	3.4	1.0	151	3.3	1.1
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	106	3.3	0.9	135	3.2	1.1
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	123	3.2	1.0	143	3.1	1.0
Provisions for training in the use of technology	118	3.0	1.0	126	2.9	1.0
Student development services	101	3.3	0.9	113	3.1	1.0

Table 8 (Continued)

Ratings of Selected Statements Related to Academic Programs and Student Services:

	On-Campus			Off-Campus		
Statement	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Counseling and career development . . .	102	3.1	1.0	114	2.9	1.0
Remedial services available	75	3.2	0.8	81	3.1	0.8
Student government opportunities	68	3.1	0.8	61	2.7	0.9
Student behavior policies and procedures	90	3.7	0.8	86	3.4	0.9
Financial aid services	105	3.4	1.1	71	2.8	1.1
Health services	58	3.2	0.8	52	2.8	1.0
Alumni affairs	62	3.3	0.8	70	3.0	1.0
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	87	3.5	1.0	84	3.2	0.9
Adequacy of physical resources in classrooms	163	3.4	0.9	169	3.6	0.9
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	169	3.8	0.8	181	4.0	0.8
Overall quality of this academic program	172	3.8	0.8	181	4.0	0.8

Rating Scale

1	Very Dissatisfied	4	Satisfied
2	Dissatisfied	5	Very Satisfied
3	Neutral, Neither Agree nor Disagree	NA	Not Applicable
		U	Unknown or Unable to Answer

A caution should be made that when viewing these statistics, nearly all respondents offered a numerical response to statements such as **Clarity of written admission policies** (On-campus N = 187; Off-campus N = 185), **Length of the academic program** (On-campus N = 189; Off-campus N = 189), and **Quality of the learning environment** (On-campus N = 178; Off-campus N = 189). Responses were not made at the same level to **Student government**

opportunities (On-campus N = 68; Off-campus N = 61) and **Health services** (On-campus N = 58; Off-campus N = 52). Although criteria related to student government and health services may be considered important by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (*Criteria for Accreditation*, 1996), adult students (the majority of respondents to this survey) obviously did not share in this level of concern and frequently selected *Not Applicable* or *Unknown or Unable to Answer* to these and similar statements that may more appropriately apply to traditional students.

DISCUSSION

As first introduced in *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey* (1996), the results of comparisons between on-campus students and off-campus students offer vivid contrast to the Southern Association's traditional vision of the many benefits to on-campus residence. Off-campus respondents provided higher mean ratings than their on-campus counterparts for approximately one-half of all survey statements, including statements related to: instructional methods, delivery system, competency of the faculty, quality of the learning environment, opportunity for intellectual growth, faculty and student interaction, exposure to research scholars, and opportunity for peer interaction. In contrast, on-campus respondents indicated higher levels of satisfaction than off-campus respondents for approximately one-half of all survey statements, including statements related to the University's technology-based information resource infrastructure.

Clearly, in terms of satisfaction with access to educational opportunities, off-campus respondents did not perceive any significant disadvantage to residence away from campus. Instead, off-campus respondents indicated positive levels of satisfaction for nearly all statements associated with this study. The summative statement **Overall quality of this academic program** received a higher rating from off-campus respondents (Mean = 4.0) than their on-campus counterparts (Mean = 3.8).

Although all statements received a positive rating, a close examination of Table 8 suggests that it may be useful to examine differences between on-campus respondents and off-campus respondents regarding the University's technology-based information resource infrastructure. Generally, on-campus respondents indicated higher levels of satisfaction with technology opportunities and access to information through technology than their off-campus counterparts.

Technology and the development of the University's information resource infrastructure received considerable attention in the *Master Plan* (1995) and the *Institutional Self-Study Report* (1996), and for the last few years the University has vigorously upgraded this infrastructure. In 1994, the University spent nearly $2.5 million on the computing infrastructure, with over $1.5 million devoted exclusively to the purchase of computing equipment (*Institutional Self-Study Report*; 1996, p.269). The University continues to

support and upgrade the computing infrastructure, with over $3.6 million budgeted in Fiscal Year 1996 - 1997 for technology and related capital expenditures. Including payroll, benefits, network expenses, and technology-related capital expenditures, the University's Fiscal Year 1996 - 1997 budget includes over $8.5 million for academic and administrative computing.

As identified in *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey* (1996), the University uses a variety of means to increase student use of the technology-based information resource infrastructure. Current activities include the following:

- The University's Electronic Library was recently redesigned as a Web page. Now, even students with low-end machines and minimal training in the use of the Internet can enjoy the simplicity of text-based access to the many databases and information resources available at this valuable information resource, URL <http://localhost/var/local/html/el/index.html>.

- Telephone contact hours for the Electronic Library and the Academic Computing help desk also have been expanded, allowing all students, including students in the western United States, to receive real-time assistance on weeknights.

Technology training opportunities and computing infrastructure upgrades specifically allocated for students, staff, and faculty in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship also have been enhanced in a variety of ways:

- The School has increased service at the day-time help desk with the addition of one 20-hour per week workstudy position.

- Service from the School's help desk has been enhanced to allow late evening and weekend access via telephone, e-mail, person-to-person, and online contact with support staff.

- The School now offers campus-based training programs in use of the academic online information system (including the University's Electronic Library) and the Internet on a monthly basis for new and existing students.

- Technology training is now offered on site for off-campus students. The School currently offers training at all clusters that started less than nine months ago, as well as all new clusters.

- The School now requires all students, adjunct faculty, and cluster coordinators to have online accounts and utilize them.

- Plans are in process effective January 1, 1997, to post all course syllabi and course information online. This action, coupled with several other new online systems, will increase the value of the online academic computing system.

- The quality and quantity of computing technology equipment available for use in the classroom has been upgraded by the purchase of additional laptop computers and projection devices, so that faculty at all cluster sites can use laptop computers in the classroom.

- Over $90,000 has been budgeted for computers and media display devices for East Campus classrooms.

- A Computing Technology Specialist has been hired to work with the faculty to integrate technology into the curriculum with respect to courseware, course/faculty World Wide Web home pages, and electronic books/tutorials.

It is important to emphasize that the above activities are currently in place—they are not part of a future plan. It is also important to emphasize that, overall, off-campus students were basically in parity to their on-campus counterparts regarding levels of satisfaction with academic program and student services. Improvements to the technology infrastructure should further enhance levels of student satisfaction.

SUMMARY

This study provided a comparison between on-campus students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship and their off-campus counterparts, with focus directed to a variety of survey statements associated with the University's compliance with accreditation criteria. On-campus respondents and off-campus respondents were in near parity in regard to levels of satisfaction with academic program and student services.

Prior assumptions that the School needs to continue to expand resources and training activities to improve access to the University's technology-based information resource network were confirmed. Although off-campus students did not express the same level of satisfaction with the University's information infrastructure as their on-campus counterparts, both groups of students generally indicated positive levels of satisfaction. It is anticipated that the University's current expenditure of funds for technology and technology-related training will result in greater use of and satisfaction with this evolving resource.

REFERENCES

Criteria for Accreditation. (1996). Decatur, Georgia: Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us What They Think About Their University Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-02.

Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center For the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-05.

Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experiences. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-06.

Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience with Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-07.

Guidelines for Planning Distance Learning Activities. (1992). Decatur, Georgia: Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Institutional Self-Study Report. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University.

Master Plan. (1995). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 95-16.

Nova Southeastern University Fact Book. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-01.

Off-Campus Program Directory. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Office of Licensure and State Relations.

Place of Class Attendance at Nova Southeastern University: Calendar Years 1990 to 1994. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-03.

Quality Improvement Plans, Administrative and Educational Support Services: 1994-95. (1995). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 95-09.

Research and Planning Weekly Enrollment Report, April 29, 1996. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning.

South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-08.

Status Report on Institutional Effectiveness: 1994 - 1995. (1995). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 95-11.

Nova Southeastern University

SURVEY OF STUDENTS

Purpose of This Survey:

As part of a continuous process of evaluation of academic programs and student services, the purpose of this survey is to determine your general level of satisfaction with your experience at the University. Results will be used to help the University provide an improved educational experience for future students.

Survey Methodology:

This survey is to be distributed to a sample of students who attend class sometime during Spring 1996. If by chance you receive this survey in multiple classes, please complete this survey only once.

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIIC INFORMATION

Instructions: Check the appropriate response(s) for the following identifiers

Academic Center

____ School of Psychology
____ Center for Undergraduate Studies
____ Center for the Advancement of Education
____ School of Business and Entrepreneurship
____ School of Computer and Information Sciences

Degree level for your current program

____ Bachelor's
____ Master's
____ Specialist
____ Doctoral
____ Other _____

Gender

____ Female
____ Male

Ethnic Group

____ African-American
____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
____ Asian or Pacific Islander
____ Hispanic
____ White
____ Other _____

Where do you attend the majority of your classes?

____ Davie Campus or East Campus
____ North Miami Beach Campus
____ Cluster Location in Broward, Dade, Monroe, or Palm Beach County
____ Cluster Location in Another Florida County
____ Cluster Location in Another State
____ Cluster Location in Another Country
____ Other _____

If you have received technology-based instruction in any of your courses, which media have you experienced? ***Check all selections that apply.***

____ Audiobridge
____ Compressed Video
____ Electronic Mail
____ Electronic Classroom
____ Other _____

Excluding courses this term, how many courses have you completed in this academic program at the University?

____ 0 courses
____ 1 course
____ 2 courses
____ 3 courses
____ 4 courses
____ 5 courses
____ 6 courses
____ 7 courses
____ 8 courses
____ 9 or more courses

Please turn to the other side ➡

Why did you decide to attend NSU? Check all selections that apply.

____ Academic Reputation
____ Admissions Standards
____ Advice of Counselors and Teachers
____ Availability of Scholarships or Financial Aid
____ Convenience
____ Cost
____ Location
____ Small Class Size
____ Social Atmosphere
____ Type of Programs Available
____ Other_____

If you had <u>not</u> attended NSU, would you have attended:

____ Another private college or university in South Florida
____ Another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida
____ A private college or university in another state
____ A state college or university in South Florida
____ A state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida
____ A state college or university in another state
____ Not attended a college or university
____ Other_____

SECTION II: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND STUDENT SERVICES

Please review the following rating scale and then mark or circle your reaction to each statement:

RATING SCALE

1	Very Dissatisfied	4	Satisfied
2	Dissatisfied	5	Very Satisfied
3	Neutral, Neither Agree nor Disagree	NA	Not Applicable
		U	Unknown or Unable to Answer

1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written admission policies
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written completion requirements
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Program orientation
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Length of the academic program
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Length of the individual courses
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Instructional methods
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Delivery system
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Course registration activities
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Published grading policy
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Interaction with administrative personnel
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Competency of the faculty
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Quality of the learning environment
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Process for assigning students to advisors
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Quality of advising
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Opportunity for intellectual growth
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Faculty and student interaction
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Exposure to research scholars
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Opportunity for peer interaction
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Clarity of program catalog
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Correctness of student records (including transcripts)
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Availability of library and learning resource materials
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Adequacy of library and learning resource materials
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Orientation program relative to library services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Training in access to information in electronic and other formats
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Availability of computing resources
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Adequacy of computing resources
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Access to information through technology
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Infusion of information technology into the curricula
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Provisions for training in the use of technology
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Student development services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Counseling and career development
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Remedial services available
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Student government opportunities
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Student behavior policies and procedures
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Financial aid services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Health services
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Alumni affairs
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Refund policies when withdrawing from courses
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Adequacy of physical resources in classrooms
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment
1 2 3 4 5 NA U	Overall quality of this academic program

For tracking purposes only, please list:

_____ The number of this course

_____ Today's date

03/96

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparision between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students	
Author(s): Dr. Thomas W. MacFarland	
Corporate Source: Nova Southeastern University	Publication Date: August 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Thomas W MacFarland	Printed Name/Position/Title: Senior Research Associate THOMAS W MACFARLAND
Organization/Address: Nova Southeastern University 3301 College Avenue Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314	Telephone: 561-715-8702 FAX E-Mail Address: tommac@nova.edu Date: 3-21-97

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.